

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2, 3, 14 and 15 will be cancelled. Claims 1, 4-13 and 16-20 will thereafter remain pending.

In the office action mailed January 8, 2008, claims 1 and 13 were objected to because the word “copy” was misspelled in the term, -- network-copy database --. Claims 16 and 20 were also objected to because the word “the” was considered redundant in the term, -- the at least the first session --.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 7,243,163 to Friend et al.

In response to the office action, claims 1, 13, 16 and 20 have been amended to correct the typographical errors that were objected to by the Examiner. Independent claims 1 and 13 have also been amended to traverse the rejections that were made under §102(e). Various dependent claims have been amended to make them conform to the amended independent claims and to overcome the objections that were made by the Examiner.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 3. Claim 13 has been amended to include claims 14 and 15.

The independent claims now require the session state information values sent out by either the mobile node or the network part, to be comprised of two values or numbers. One value is a “prior session” value; the other value is an “expected-session” value. The “prior session” value is a value that identifies a sequential number of a prior synchronization session; the “expected-session” value is a value of the next synchronization session. The two values enable the recipient of the synchronization message to unambiguously determine whether a synchronization message is proper.

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 because of Friend. The Examiner also rejected claims 2 and 3, which depended from claim 1. The Examiner rejected claims 14 and 15, which depended from claim 13.

By this amendment, claims 2 and 3 have been combined into claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 have been combined into claim 13.

The Examiner asserted that claims 2 and 3 were invalid under §102 because the messages disclosed in Friend each include or are assigned a sequential code that indicates the relative order in which the message transaction was generated. Claims 14 and 15 were rejected for the same reason. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of claims 2 and 3 and 14 and 15 because Friend does not show the transmission of two values in or with a synchronization message as the amended independent claims now require.

FIG. 4 of the pending application illustrates a message sequence diagram for the applicant's invention. FIG. 4 clearly shows that two values or numbers are transmitted to a recipient device. Other specification text clearly states that two values are transmitted to a recipient.

Since the Examiner has rejected the claims under §102, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to show where each and every claim limitation can be found in the cited reference. Unless the Examiner can identify by column and line number where Friend discloses the transmission of a synchronization message having both a "session identification value" and an "expected session value" as the amended claims now require, the claims should be allowed to issue. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com